



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,310	02/12/2004	Keith B. Gorden	58232US004	5538
32692	7590	09/05/2006	EXAMINER	
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427				ROBINSON, HOPE A
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
				1656

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/777,310	GORDEN ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hope A. Robinson	1656

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/8/06.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 21 and 30-44 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 21 and 30-44 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Application Status

1. Applicant's response to the Office Action mailed March 24, 2006 on June 8, 2006, is acknowledged.

Claim Disposition

2. Claims 1-20 and 22-29 are cancelled. Claims 21 and 30-44 are pending and are under examination.

Withdrawn-Objection to Claims

3. Previous objection to claims are withdrawn by virtue of submission of an amendment.

New-Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 21 and 30-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably

convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claimed invention is directed to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a TLR8 agonist in combination with a carrier. The claim is not clearly defined by any structural limitations. It is noted that claim 21 recites a laundry list of compounds, however, there is no indication in the claim as to how each compound associates with each other or are connected via chemical bonds for example. It is noted that claims 30-44 recites one TLR8 agonist from the listing in claim 21, however, this does not rectify the deficiency in providing a nexus between one compound and the next. In addition, the recited compounds in claims 30-44 could have any amounts of substituents attached to the compound. In addition, claim 21 is directed to several derivatives, which are not adequately described. A skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the agonist as claimed. In addition, the claim encompasses a genus of agonist. The instant specification fails to provide a representative number of species for the claimed genus. A representative number of species means that the species, which are adequately described, are representative of the entire genus. Thus the claims lack adequate written description to demonstrate to a skilled artisan that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention. An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. See *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Therefore, a biomolecule sequence described only by a functional characteristic, without any known or disclosed correlation between that function and the structure of the sequence, normally is not a

sufficient identifying characteristic for written description purposes, even when accompanied by a method of obtaining the claimed sequence. For example, even though a genetic code table would correlate a known amino acid sequence with a genus of coding nucleic acids, the same table cannot predict the native, naturally occurring nucleic acid sequence of a naturally occurring mRNA or its corresponding cDNA. *See MPEP 2163.*

Further, *Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir. 1991), states that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, whatever is now claimed" (See page 1117). The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed" (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of encoded proteins, and therefore, conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. *See Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993). *See MPEP 2163.*

Therefore, for all these reasons the specification lacks adequate written description, and one of skill in the art cannot reasonably conclude that the applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the instant application was filed.

5. Claims 21 and 30-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a specific TLR8 agonist, does not reasonably provide enablement for any or all TLR8 agonist and any amounts of substituents added to said compounds or any derivatives thereof for the structures set forth in claim 21. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The enablement requirement refers to the requirement that the specification describe how to make and how to use the invention. There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is undue. These factors include, but are not limited to: Quantity of Experimentation Necessary; Amount of direction or guidance presented; Presence or absence of working examples; Nature of the Invention; State of the prior art and Relative skill of those in the art; Predictability or unpredictability of the art and Breadth of the claims (see *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The factors most relevant to the instant invention are discussed below.

The amount of experimentation required to practice the claimed invention is undue as the claims encompass an unspecified amount of agonist that can comprise any amounts of substituents attached to the structure. Further, the claims do not provide a structure *per se*, as there is no indication in the claims how each compound is associated with each other, for example how are they bonded to each other. For example, the specification indicates that the TLR8 agonist can be a tetrahydromimidazoquinoline amine, however, said agonist can comprise substituents attached for which no guidance is provided. In addition, claim 21 is directed to a

genus of derivatives for which no guidance is provided. A skilled artisan would have to engage in undue experimentation to first determine if a protein is of the TLR8 family and then test to see if it has the desired activity.

The skilled artisan would recognize the high degree of unpredictability that all proteins belonging to the TLR8 family would be an agonist or that all agonist of the TLR8 family of proteins would function as desired in the pharmaceutical composition. The specification lacks adequate guidance/direction to enable a skilled artisan to practice the claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims. The specification does not provide support for the broad scope of the claim, which encompasses an unspecified amount of agonist. The issue in this case is the breadth of the claims in light of the predictability of the art as determined by the number of working examples, the skill level artisan and the guidance presented in the instant specification and the prior art of record. This make and test position is inconsistent with the decisions of *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) where it is stated that "...scope of claims must bear a reasonable correlation to scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art...". Without sufficient guidance, determination of having the desired biological characteristics is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily and improperly extensive and undue. See *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Thus, for all these reasons, the specification is not considered to be enabling for one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention as the amount of experimentation required is undue. Therefore, the claimed invention cannot be practiced in a manner that reasonably correlates with the scope of the claims, to be considered enabling.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 21 and 30-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter, which applicant (s) regard as their invention.

Claim 21 and the dependent claims hereto are indefinite for the recitation of a laundry list of compounds as it is unclear how the compounds are associated. No nexus is provided between the recited compounds to give a clear picture of a structure, for example is the substituted imidazoquinoline amine attached to the tetrahydroimidazoquinoline?

New-Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 21 and 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Richardson (J. of Org. Chem., vol. 25, page 1138, 1963), based on the recognition in the art water is a carrier.

Richardson teach substituted imidazoquinoline amines. Claims 21 and 30 are anticipated as the structure of the compound is disclosed by the reference, thus would inherently be a "Toll-like receptor agonist". In addition, the claims recite the open language "comprises" which

indicates that other structures can be present, and also the claims do not indicate a connection or association between the listing of compounds recited in for example claim 21. Thus, the limitations of the claims are met by the reference.

Withdrawn-Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. Previous rejection to claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, enablement is withdrawn by virtue of submission of an amendment.

Withdrawn-Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. Previous rejection to claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 is withdrawn by virtue of applicant's amendments and arguments.

Maintained-Basis For NonStatutory Double Patenting

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

11. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5 and 8 of copending application number 10/788,731. An obvious-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). *See In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); and In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985).* Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

The instant application claim is directed to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a TLR8 agonist in combination with a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier. The copending application is directed to a method to identify a compound that modulates TLR-mediated activity employing TLR8 and a pharmaceutical composition comprising same. The two sets of claims differ in that the copending application recites a method and composition. However, note that the

term modulate in the copending application, means increase or decrease (hence agonist/antagonist). Although the scope of the claims herein differs, as the copending application claims are coupled with a method, the two sets of claims are obvious variations of each other and are *prima facie* obvious.

This is a provisional obvious-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

12. The response filed on June 8, 2006 has been considered. With regard to the Obvious-type Double Patenting rejection, applicant on page 6 of the response state that this rejection will be deferred until notification of an allowance. Thus, as no terminal disclaimer was filed the rejection remains. Applicant's arguments presented on page 5 of the response regarding the 112 first paragraph rejections are noted. Note however, the rejections of record have been withdrawn. New grounds of rejections have been instituted under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs for the reasons stated above.

Note that new grounds of rejections have been instituted under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103- Obvious-type Double Patenting for the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

13. No claims are presently allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hope A. Robinson whose telephone number is 571-272-0957.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathleen Kerr, can be reached at (571) 272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hope Robinson, MS
Patent Examiner
HOPE ROBINSON
PATENT EXAMINER
8/16/06